

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION - CINCINNATI

NATHANIEL DANTE RICE,	:	Case No. 1:22-cv-695
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Matthew W. McFarland
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
SHERIFF RICHARD K. JONES, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (Doc. 20)

This matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) of United States Magistrate Judge Karen L. Litkovitz (Doc. 20), to whom this case is referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the Report, Magistrate Judge Litkovitz recommends that Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend (Doc. 11) be denied. (*See* Report, Doc. 20.) Plaintiff timely filed objections to the Report (*See* Objections, Doc. 22), and Defendants responded in opposition to Plaintiff’s objections (*See* Response, Doc. 25). Thus, the matter is ripe for the Court’s review.

Magistrate Judge Litkovitz recommends that Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend be denied because this Court lacks jurisdiction to press criminal charges and the amended complaint seeks to reinstate claims that have already been dismissed. (Report, Doc. 20, Pg. ID 338-39.) Plaintiff’s objections, however, fail to adequately confront the Report’s reasoning or conclusions. Plaintiff fails to identify anything specific he believes to be incorrect in the Report. *See Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995). At most,

Plaintiff solely makes the conclusory statement that his “motion to amend presents additional facts to support [his] claims against various staff members at Butler County Jail.” (Objections, Doc. 22, Pg. ID 346.) Such nonspecific and conclusory objections are “tantamount to a complete failure to object.” *Bradley v. United States*, No. 18-1444, 2018 WL 5084806, at *3 (6th Cir. Sept. 17, 2018) (quoting *Cole v. Yukins*, 7 F. App'x 354, 356 (6th Cir. 2001)).

Thus, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has made a de novo review of the record in this case. Upon review, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Objections (Doc. 22) are not well-taken and are accordingly **OVERRULED**. The Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 20) in its entirety and **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (Doc. 11).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

By: 
JUDGE MATTHEW W. McFARLAND